

7166
THE

ORIGIN

of

The Gallie Plant,

with its

BANEFUL INFLUENCE

in the

GARDEN OF EUROPE.



Manchester,

PRINTED BY C. WHEELER AND SON,

1799.

ORIGIN

The Origin of



PRINTED BY A. WATKINS AND SON

EXCINDE EAM: QUORSUM ETIAM TERRAM
INUTILEM REDDIT.

THE Plant here alluded to, is that Tree of Liberty which, after being banished Great Britain, in the reign of Charles the Second, from the destruction to freedom it occasioned in the tyrannical usurpation of Cromwell, found its way to America, where it was nourished until it ripened into insurrection against the Parent State, and, from the nature of the climate, became a kind of patriotic *arbor vitæ* throughout the vast continent.

This tree, so well planted and watered, flourished more and more, and imparted many a slip and sucker to grow in climates which appeared most ungenial to its cultivation. It extended its growth through every part of the beautiful kingdom of France, and, like poisonous weed, over-run Belgium, Holland, Sardinia, and most of the German, Italian and Neapolitan States, as if it was destined to destroy the cultivation of every country, to spread over the world a total dereliction of all principles, and to annihilate every relation which has hitherto ensured the safety of Governments, and the prosperity of nations. They who live in its vicinity are to prepare to live in perpetual conspiracies and endless seditions. The nature of this tree is immutable. It can never cease to be restless, tormenting, and encroaching. Its neighbourhood is contagious; its atmosphere pestilential; its leaves destructive; its vicinity is worse than the plague.

plague. To this we are to attribute a system of the most horrid tyranny that mortals ever suffered. Where is the boasted happy state of man, promised under every Republican form of Government where this tree has been planted? Where are his imprescriptible rights, the sacred pledge of the Revolution of France? Are we to look for them in the exile of multitudes, torn from their families, and without the form of a trial sent to perish on inhospitable shores, on the torrid sands, and under the vertical suns of Guiana? or are we to view this blessed state of liberty, in driving many thousand persons from their native soil, because they have been entitled to the rank of nobility? This was the proposal of a nation, who pretended to imitate the Romans, which ordained festivals to humanity, justice, mercy, generosity, and all the social virtues.

To strip the Monarch of his inherent rights, the nobility of their rank and fortune, the clergy of their freeholds, and to reduce mankind to a level, are actions of such immoral and dangerous tendency, as we should think no men in their senses could attempt to justify, much less to immortalize; or if they deserve immortality, it should be an immortality of infamy.

In the funeral eulogium of the tyrant General Hoche, in the Camp de Mars, the following passage forms one of the most prominent features of the infamous designs of the French: *Thou rejoicest, proud Albion, in the death of a hero, who spread terror and dismay along thy coast. Yet tremble; a time will come, when thou shalt experience French valour. We will plant the tricoloured banner on thy coast; we will conquer peace in thy capital.* This language is easily understood; the tricoloured banner is every where the signal of disorganization and pillage. On comparing these expressions with the lofty proclamation of Dumourier, it becomes evident that the spirit of the French Revolution remains unaltered; and that to produce a Revolution in this country is the aim of the Directory,

tory, as it was that of Robespierre. On drawing a further parallel between these expressions and the meek language of the French Plenipotentiaries presented to Lord Malmesbury, there can remain no doubt that this hypocritical note was merely intended to deceive the multitude; for no Government will make use of such gross insults and menaces against another, with which it sincerely wishes to negotiate a peace.

But to estimate whether France is capable of maintaining the accustomed relations of peace and amity, ask the opinions of those countries who have now governors, not whom they respect, but whom they dread. Have the principles of their new rulers been unexceptionably just? Have their dispositions proved uniformly forbearing and pacific towards those whom they might insult and trample upon with impunity, or have they not, after giving reiterated pacific assurances, hostilely attacked their allies who were quiet in their positions, and carried hostility to the greatest extent by surprize? Ask the opinion of those countries, and then let the question be decided, whether the political integrity and good faith of France is such as we ought to confide in? Let us look to her transactions in Italy, and to the professions with which she entered their territories. Let Austrian Flanders and the Dutch come forward to testify her promises, and compare them with what they have done, and then let them say, whether they are not laid in perpetual bonds. Let them speak of their forced loans, and their violated territory. But above all let the Grand Duke of Tuscany enumerate the consequences and the rewards of his uniform predilection for the amity of France. His dominions invaded, his powers of sovereignty outraged, his subjects pillaged, and his principal port forcibly converted into a French garrison for the purpose of annihilating the Tuscan commerce. These are the fruits of republican leagues.

When

When his Sardinian Majesty received information of the surprize of his fortresses of Navarra, Alexandria and Suza, and that the avenues to Turin were in possession of the French, he issued a proclamation, stating his punctual observance of every article in the treaties concluded between him and the Republic, declaring his determination to maintain the interests of his people and crown, and assuring his faithful subjects that he had in no instance given occasion to the measures which had recently taken place. The proclamation, though mild and moderate, immediately excited the apprehensions of the chief agents of France, who, fearful of the result of it, immediately compelled the King, with the dagger and firebrand of intimidation in their hands, to retract and suppress it. They threatened to bombard and set fire to Turin, and the unfortunate Monarch was forced, from the love of his subjects, to sign the act of his own degradation, and their slavery.

I tremble for the cause of liberty, from such an example to Kings. I tremble for the cause of humanity, in the unpunished outrages of the most wicked of mankind. Could we suppose Liberty to have fixed her seat in France; and she can never be found in the absence of order; even she must turn aside, and blush for the conduct of her pretended votaries.

Every feeling heart must revolt from cruelty unprovoked, and the more when it is associated with freedom mis-called. We fly with terror and abhorrence from the altar of liberty, when we see it stained with the blood of the aged, of the innocent, of the defenceless sex, of the ministers of religion, and the faithful adherents of a fallen monarch. Our hearts sink within us, when we see it streaming with the blood of the monarch himself, executed with circumstances of indignity, that bespeak not the justice of an august national tribunal, but the contemptible triumph of little minds, devoid of every dignified sentiment and of all virtuous sympathy.

Did

Did they who executed a dethroned king, know so little of the human heart, as not to know that to him, the humiliation he had already suffered was worse than death? It was not necessary to look back on the former elevation of the sufferer, to pity the gloomy transition in his fate. It was not necessary to recollect that he, who was to suffer death by the hands of an executioner, was once the greatest monarch of Europe, and had the destiny of twenty millions of people at the disposal of his will. If he felt, as men commonly feel, in being degraded from the power of a King, to be a mere machine without any kind of deliberation, he could have no generous interest to excite him to action. To inferior people such an office might be matter of honour; but to be raised to it, and to descend to it, suggest quite different conceptions.

It would certainly have been more generous, and it was equally practicable, to have actually executed what the King only nominally agreed to: but to deprive that unfortunate Monarch of his power, and afterwards to compel him to set his own seal to his misfortunes and dishonour, seems to have been a refinement in cruelty that is alone congenial to the spirit and character of modern Republicanism; founded, as an eminent author observes, in an envious hatred of greatness, and a sullen desire of independence; in petulance impatient of controul, and pride disdainful of superiority. Its predominant desire is to destroy rather than to establish, not feeling so much the love of liberty, as repugnance to authority. There is a mockery of the miseries it inflicts—there is an insult added to the outrages it commits, that stamps their excesses with something peculiarly inimitable and its own; so that whatever can be done to overthrow such horrible tyranny, which leads to the triumph of anarchy, the downfall of all thrones, and the destruction of all regular Governments, would be the greatest and most beneficial

beneficial act of kindness. It would be the happiest thing for Europe, and the proudest for that country that should be instrumental in effecting, of any event upon record, if the day should arrive when an opening occurred to overthrow such tyranny, which is not more alarming to the independent powers of Europe, than fatal to those under its immediate domination. This would be a proud day indeed.

While all the powers of Europe were interesting themselves in the melancholy lot of the French King, or whilst they were devising means for snatching him from the fury of his assassins; the Americans alone (who had so frequently acknowledged and proclaimed *him*. their deliverer) seemed, by their silence, not to have regarded his misfortunes—Louis had scarcely perished under the sword of his murderers, when all the powers of Europe united to revenge his fall. The Americans alone remained neuter.

But was it for an arbitrary Monarch to emancipate America from the yoke of British oppression? Could the King of France seriously wish to obtain for foreigners, his ancient foes, those blessings which he himself withheld from his own subjects? Was it for him, who was unconscious of the invaluable rights of civil and religious liberty, to set up for a vindicator of those rights for those who became insensible of their benefactor? The ingratitude he met with from his new allies, gives no great encouragement to Princes to copy his example.

I shall only observe, of his indiscreet interference in the American contest, that, without dwelling on the immorality of the measure, it was highly impolitic—For it was by encouraging subjects in America to revolt against their lawful Sovereign, that the authors and abettors of the French revolution first conceived the elements of their disorganizing system, which were not new, but obsolete. The doctrines of the
present

present day have been preached in æras far remote from the present. They were the doctrines of Cromwell's days; nay, we may trace them higher still. They have always roared forth their incoherencies with fanatical howlings and with unfailing constancy, whenever the times were most favourable to their reception. This hath ever been the common effect of democracy rising to power. In ancient times, the banishment of just Aristides, the death of Socrates, the punishment of Timotheus, are parallel instances of the democratic temper.

To this origin we trace the murderers of Louis the XVIth. of France, and the regicides of Charles the Ist. of England. But to pass from the original source of these calamities, and to follow this tree in its various ramifications, would be to lead you to a society of French gardeners in Britain, of a nature and description before unknown to any country, instituted with a view to replant slips of this tree once more in England, and to overturn the laws, constitution and government, civil and ecclesiastical, both in Great Britain and Ireland; as well as to dissolve the connection between the two kingdoms, so necessary to the security and prosperity of both. It would be to unfold to you confederacies and correspondencies of the most alarming nature, formed in several countries, which have thrown many parts of Europe into open disorder. In many others there is a hollow murmuring under ground. A confused movement is felt that threatens a general earthquake in the political world.

The desperate fury of embodied factions in Ireland, the constant communication which they maintain with France, and the alarming circumstance of their being subject to the same secret direction, and the same chiefs; whose sanguinary malice forms the wild and extravagant plan of seizing, in the same night, all the leading people over the whole island, may convince you that what they want in numbers, they strive to make up in activity. This conspiracy, if not power-

ful, is daring, and though not operating to its full extent, has been unhappily felt and exemplified in the distractions and calamities of that kingdom, where the emissaries of sedition, the agitators of revolt, the meditating harpies of homicidal rapine, sit in murderous senate, decreeing the downfall of every establishment, the overthrow and total extinction of whatever is pious, generous or grand in our religious, civil, and political institutions.

The Princes of Europe had nothing to dread from the banishment of James the Second of England, but their descendants had one common cause with Louis XVI. of France. The family of Stuart, banished by the English nation, wandered over Europe unpitied and abandoned; the family of Bourbon found support and assistance.

England had only changed the person, not the family of its Sovereign—France had changed the form of its Government. England only desired to retain a limited Monarchy—France had not only subverted Monarchy, but had set principles on float, which, if suffered to spread, might go to the general subversion of monarchical power. The hand of the assassin had been successfully raised against one unfortunate Monarch, was in principle extended to our own, and to every Monarch on the face of the globe.

The most striking singularities that characterize this eventful period, are the treaties of two continental Monarchs with the French rulers. That the chief of the younger branch of the House of Bourbon should enter into negotiations with those, who, with their own hands, murdered the chief of his illustrious family, and even authorize his officers to improve and perfect their military knowledge in the school of these assassins, must be highly gratifying to the revolutionists, who glory in the humiliation of the regal powers. Great numbers of Spaniards were now flocking to France; the Revolution was probably already effected in the minds of many of the subjects
of

of Spain, and the frequent intercourse between the two nations may bring it about as soon as the Government of France finds it expedient to convulse the dominions of its new Ally. The first tocsin against the House of Bourbon was rung at Paris; perhaps the moment may not be far distant, when the second will resound at Madrid.

The declaration of another late continental Monarch, wherein he endeavours to justify his treaty of peace with the French Rulers, which was the prime source of our calamities, and at that time the subject of universal execration, fell little short of an attempt to dissolve the confederative system of the Germanic Empire, and exposed his Prussian Majesty to the same process of outlawry as was instituted against his illustrious ancestor. For after the war had been determined upon by a general conclusion, and sanctioned by the supreme Chief of the Empire, it was to be continued by its members, till another conclusion, legalized by the same sanction, had abolished and abrogated the former. It is a mortifying spectacle to those who do not love to contemplate the fall of human greatness, to see crowned heads waiting as patient suitors in the anti-chambers of regicides. Is it possible to place any thing called royalty in a more degrading point of view? They who wish to participate in the fraternity of France, to become the allies of regicides, murderers and atheists, must be parties in their crimes, and evidently share their ruin.

I mean not here to draw a parallel between Princes sinking many degrees below Zeno in the descending scale of political degradation; but could say much in favour of a royal sufferer, if I did not fear to hurt those whom I am unable to serve. There are those of our nation who feel for his unmerited sufferings with no common sensibility. What I say is a testimony as far as one feeble voice can go. But were I to contrast his sufferings with those of King

Charles the First, this would be inaccurate. The latter, though not less unfortunate, was still invested with the power delegated to him by the nation, when it passed judgment upon him; and this circumstance contributed to increase the severity of the decision. The English condemned their King, and afterward for a while abolished royalty; whereas the French, on the contrary, first abolished royalty, and then passed sentence upon, and executed him who had been their King.

The streams of blood that followed this boasted Revolution, and the numberless widows and orphans that record its effects; nay, the Royal Widow's anguish, embittered by the reflection that her orphans had been made the instruments of contumely and death against the womb that bare them, are not yet sufficient to gratify the Republican appetite!

Ask the Batavian, the Venetian, the Fleming, the Italian, and even the German, how they have profited by Republican Liberty? Their answer must be, that liberty, general subversion, and universal plunder, are, in the revolutionary jargon, synonymous terms. Enquire of the United Provinces, the boasted Dutch Republic, where is their commercial grandeur? Where their wealth, their credit, and their consequence? These High and Mighty Lords will now tell you, that they are become the mean and humble slaves of France. The Italians too, will confess, that all those rare ornaments of the fine arts, which made Italy the admiration of foreigners, are now swallowed up in the vortex of French equality, the greatest curse that ever visited their countries.

Such have been the baneful fruits of the modern tree of liberty, which, like the original one of knowledge, brought death into the world. The chief hope of the planters of it, in accomplishing their design, rested on the propagation of republican principles, which have been acted upon by France in conjunction with domestic traitors, and pursued up to the present moment

moment by proceedings involved in mysterious secrecy. This system of blind obedience has had indeed the effect of disgusting and alarming some of the delegates, who perceived themselves to be instruments in the hands of an unknown authority, for purposes, of which the extent was never fully disclosed to them; yet the events to which this atrocious system has led, the page of history, darkened with the foulest deeds that ever excited horror in the human heart, will but too faithfully record; and those dreadful instances of sanguinary malice will be remembered, as long as persecuted virtue shall deserve the pity, and deliberate cruelty the execration of mankind; cruelty that had its origin in those principles of foreign growth, which the French imbibed in America, and which they incessantly labour to disseminate among all the countries in Europe, and among all descriptions of men in it.

Touch not this Gallic Plant, whose fibres are bitterness, and its fruits slavery and death. The Garden of Europe is before you. Of every tree of the garden ye may freely eat; but of this Plant of Gallic growth, touch it not, lest ye die. The planters of it are the despots of the world, the scourge of the human race; who seek an empire over the fortunes, and the controul of the liberties of mankind. Their boasted Rights of Man are the greatest wrongs of human nature. Instead of being the principles of just Government, they are but the elements of public discord; doctrines as impracticable as they are incoherent and absurd.

Because there have been evils in Government, shall there be no more Monarchs, nor ministers of state, nor ministers of the Gospel, nor interpreters of law, or general officers? And to complete the admirable excellence of the system, is the power to be derived from those who are to be the subjects of it, that is, who are not in possession of the power which is to be derived from them. Time will be the best refutation of the new political doctrines of
the

the present day, which, whether considered as subjects of speculative enquiry in this, or of practical experiment in a neighbouring country, have evidently their tendency to produce the most baneful effects. The employment of modern philosophers has been to place truth upon the clouds, to give her a varying form and a fleeting substance, as private motives might require. They have never descended so low as to consult human nature, or the history, the national character, the habits, or other local circumstances of the country they meant to benefit by their labours. The constitution of a country is a relative thing, the excellence of which does not so much depend upon abstract qualities, as upon its suitableness to the nation to which it appertains. A common form of government would no more suit mankind than a common climate. But this our modern philosophers know not, or seem not to know. They have no guide but fancy in framing their plans of government, and they are as wide of each other as of sense and reason, in their ærial flights. The liberal minded advocates for liberty and equality, would they condescend to be instructed by experience, must confess the impossibility of regulating the proceedings of any number of men, who claim equal rights, without some superior to keep them in order. Power of some kind or other must exist in the community. In all situations of life there must be supremacy. Nature points it out in the irrational creature; and experience and reason prove its necessity among mankind. To argue otherwise, is to ridicule the logic of the mind, and place the attributes of man below a society of brutes.

Power, by which I mean supreme power, can no more originate from the people, than the soul can originate from the body, or than Heaven can originate from earth—the higher produces the lower, the greater the less, and not the inverse of it.

The

The English laws call the King our Sovereign Lord, and the very purpose of civil Government is to take the Sovereignty out of the hands of those, who by the nature of the thing can never exercise it—As to the mass of the people, they would never think of proposing any public measures. To turn them into statesmen and politicians is to be no less an enemy to them, than to the state. Whilst they are employed in their proper callings, they are unquestionably the props and supporters of their country; but their time would be very trivially and fruitlessly employed by endeavouring to seek at a knowledge which, from their uneducated habits and peculiar casts of life; they are neither calculated nor competent to imbibe. For of whom are those denominated the people composed? Surely not the most wise or the most virtuous. Whoever has considered unselected bodies of men as acting together (and the more numerous they are, the more strongly the observation holds) must know that they are directed not by the wisest counsels, but the most specious, or those which are most artfully displayed. They must know, that they adopt in general not the most virtuous plans, but those which are the most flattering to the passions. A country governed by the multitude must become the seat of confusion and of utter wretchedness. Universal liberty in society is no better than universal misery—Whilst we subsist together in a state of society, we have nothing to fear so much as the despotism of the mob, the oppression of that many-headed tyrant, the people. Here are champions for the laws of the land—Your Sovereign Lords, whose actions are not to be blamed, being the necessary attendants on new born liberty, the justifiable excesses of men mad with freedom. But can that be called government which is under the controul of the patriot mob; or is there in reality such a thing as the Majesty of the People. Does it exist in any Government? Does it exist even in a Republic or a Democracy? Some portion of the people must exercise a sovereignty over the rest. The sovereignty consequently can only reside in that part
to

to whom it is transferred, and the remainder and greater portion are divested of supreme power, and are only to be viewed as subjects. This supposition, then, which is so high in vogue, which is so generally received; nay, which has been palmed upon us with such confidence as undeniable and self-evident, is not only false, not only contradictory to reason, but contradictory to itself. Let us enquire who are the people: those who are called to govern, or to obey? If you mean the latter, the supposition is indefensible; it is absolutely overturned by the very principle on which it is supposed to stand.

What the consequence of such doctrines must be, it is for you to look to: to warn, is not to menace. In this awful crisis, the most awful in the history of the universe, would you tolerate debating societies, who throw themselves from society in their principles, and come forward the single prodigies of uncivilized individuality, the ungoverned lords of appetite and passion, the amazement of credulity, ignorance and disaffection?

Far be it from me to question the right of the people to speak their opinions to the different branches of the Legislature on great and important subjects; but they can only express their will by those to whom it is delegated, the legal organ of which can only be conveyed through the voice of their representatives, who, forming a part of the British Senate, should never forget the pledge given to their country so far as to secede from their duty in Parliament, or occasionally to return, as it should seem, for no other purpose than that of perplexing its debates, and disconcerting its unanimity. I should by no means be justified in arraiging the proceedings of those who, moving in spheres greatly elevated above my own, must have motives of conduct by me unseen and uncomprehended; and may be thought illiberal in enquiring, if they are seriously convinced of the insufficiency of their services in the House to promote the

the public good, how they can reasonably hope to accomplish this grand object in a tavern? If they cannot prevail upon themselves to comply with a prescribed rule of duty on one hand, why do they thus act in express opposition to it on another? Or what is it that leads them to imagine that that may be seasonably and well done in a club-room, which can only be properly discussed and legally determined upon in the senate. The question whether Government exceeds the power necessary for the preservation of society, or abuses it to its dissolution, is a question of perilous responsibility, too delicate to come within the code of human regulation, or form a chapter of human jurisprudence.

When a principle of dependency upon the King is removed, there is no room for the operation of beneficial laws, equal justice, or social subordination. There neither is, nor can be any such thing as government in the world, while subjects are allowed to plead their own private conscience against the execution of the laws. For if while the King is to govern by law, the law is to be governed by the subject's conscience, wheresoever the name and title of sovereignty may be lodged, the power is undoubtedly in those who over-rule the law; and he that brings down the law to such men's consciences who are pleased to be in an error, (though, by the way, they are seldom or never seen to be so, but very beneficially to themselves) places the legislative power in those men's consciences; and by so doing, may at length bring down his own neck to the block.

The attempt to take the sovereignty out of the hands of those in whom it is lodged, even in the smallest states, has terminated in the extremes of violence, murder and confusion, ending in the tyranny of those who inculcated this precious maxim. But surely a more palpable sophism was never attempted to be imposed upon mankind. It is no principle of common sense, or of what is the best sense reduced

to practice. When men admit or embrace the principle which is held forth in the expression of the sovereignty of the people, it is not that their understanding is deceived, but their passions inflamed, and there are some of them so radically bad, that to them the exercise of good operates as a real evil ; and the harmony of nations appears but a discord ; the regular gradations of society are unnatural deformities ; the sweets of civilization mere infirmity of mind ; contentment the true sign of slavery. No wonder, then, that they endeavour to tear up all fixed notions, to cut down all regular establishments, and to plant the Tree of Liberty in their stead. We read of the madness, but never, I believe, in Scripture, of the majesty of the people ; and believe me this shallow sophism is in no degree believed by those who disseminate it, whose meaning is to found upon it the severest and most relentless tyranny under which the human race ever groaned.

From such miserable artifices, Christian principles can alone protect us ; which, by referring all government to its heavenly original, enlarge the views, purify the passions, and, by combining conscience with expediency, derive the measures of obedience from their true and genuine motives. How strong an obstacle these interpose to the designs of the factious, and the partisans of modern codes of anarchy, is sufficiently evident from the inveterate malice which they uniformly bear to the smallest approximation to Christian doctrines.

From direct and indubitable proofs, adduced by the Abbe Barruel, it appears that this prodigious Revolution in the principles of mankind, has been the result of machinations carried on for more than half a century. It originated in a regular and profound conspiracy against Religion, in which the greatest talents, united with the most inveterate hatred, have been incessantly and indefatigably directed to that object during the whole of this long period. From the
hatred

hatred of Religion arose that of Monarchy; and, lastly, the hatred of all regular Governments, which secure the property, and restrain the passions of men.

It was in this manner the late unhappy change of things began in another country. Tythes were among the first objects of abuse and execration; then followed lordships and manors: titles and successions suffered next; and lastly that extraordinary and lamentable convulsion which has shaken Europe and the world. We have seen one Republic buried, and the execrations of a whole people poured upon its grave. Even its ghost at midnight durst no more meet the frowns of Englishmen, who have happily passed the dangers and the conflict of that political ocean, and are actually in the haven where they would be. Let them rest under the banners of substantial freedom and prosperity, nor rashly again trust their vessel, laden with the dearest pledges of public happiness, to the perils of that devouring element, wherein we behold (and with pity behold) some struggling hard with the tempest, and others broken and shattered on the rocks of public discord and confusion.

The true line of liberty has long been defined and understood in England. The reality of it has been avowed, and Englishmen consider it rather as a possession to be secured, than as a prize to be contended for; to guard which not only from invasion, but decay, is our best wisdom and first duty. We see employment enough in guarding what we possess from violation, without suffering it to pass, as one of our Poets says, *through great varieties of untried being*. Other nations may deluge their lands with blood in struggling for liberty and equality; but let it never be forgotten by ourselves, that we are in possession of both, and enjoy more repose, and greater security under a well-regulated Monarchy, than we could under any other form of government whatsoever. To the blessings of our Constitution, at this moment, we owe that exalted situation

situation we hold amidst surrounding nations, envying, distracted and distressed.

The British constitution always gains by comparison with other forms of government. All that is excellent in the American system is literally copied from it; and all that the French have gained by departing from it, has been *confusion and every evil work*.

The only congeniality that ever existed between this government and that of France, was the British constitution when overturned by Cromwell, and a self created tribunal, establishing their tyranny on the fragments of a throne reeking with the blood of their legitimate sovereign. Then indeed there was a congenial similarity between the two countries. But at present there is not a feature of the French government which wears any semblance to that of Great Britain. Every thing in this country and France seems now to be directly opposite.

In this country loyalty is the characteristic: in that, treason! In this, happiness—in that, misery. Here we have a reigning King; there an assassinated Monarch. Here, Laws; there, Anarchy! Here Religion; there Atheism!

On this occasion, it is natural to contrast the happy Constitution of Great Britain, and the felicity of its inhabitants, with the anarchy and licentiousness, the poverty and the misery, which now overwhelm the degraded kingdom of France. Let those who chuse to draw a comparison between the two nations, behold this country flourishing and free in commercial intercourse with the four quarters of the globe; happy at home, and respected abroad. Let them behold the Thames chearful, animated and industrious; floating to its proud metropolis the tributes of the habitable world; whilst the Seine, pensive, disconsolate, and, surcharged with blood, ebbs, mournfully and dejected a crimson current to the sea: and do you, O my countrymen, rejoice with me, that since Providence (from views inscrutable to our researches) has permitted the
the

the mad question of the Rights of Man to be tried upon the theatre of Europe, that we were not singled out as the dreadful example; but that it originated in countries from which, I trust, we shall have the full benefit of the issue, without the disgraceful mischiefs of the contest. For who knows but the piety, the virtues and the christian sufferings of our martyred Sovereign of blessed memory, King Charles the First, may be one great preservative of the present peace of this ungrateful nation? So that when GOD sends his destroying Angel, with his drawn sword, over other kingdoms, he looks upon the blood of that Royal Martyr, shed for the rights and liberties of Britain, and bids the destroying Angel pass over England and draw no more blood there, where the memory of that sacred blood had made such an atonement and expiation, and cried aloud for mercy upon all, even those that shed it not excepted.—However this be, it is certainly comfortable to a contemplative mind, friendly to the human race, accustomed to dwell long and often on the infatuation which has prevailed in the nations of Europe, and to notice the tide of opinion, too long diverted by faction from its natural course, setting in so strongly against the conspirators, that England, our native country, amidst not only the wreck of empires, but of social order itself, promises fair, surrounded, alas, by ruins, to continue the Land of Religion, Liberty, Commerce and Affluence.



QUIN ESTIAM MEOS ILLOS INIMICOS, QUI NOLU-
ERUNT ME REGNARE SUPRA SE, ADDUCITE HUC,
& JUGULATE CORAM ME.

A Speculative mind, accustomed to meditate on human events, to regard their causes and effects, will find perhaps as ample range of thought in the picture of the actual and existing moment, as in any æra in the history of nations. The mutability of all human things has never before been exemplified by events of such vast magnitude and extent. Nations have been brought as low as individuals, and all that we have been used to consider as great, mighty and powerful, have been humbled in the dust. The proud fabric of the French Monarchy, not many years ago stood founded, as it might seem, on the rock of time, force and opinion, supported by the triple aristocracy of the Church, the Nobility, and the Parliament. They are now crumbled into dust: they are vanished from the earth. The rash career and fatal consequences of a reforming spirit have been brought before our view by facts so striking and impressive, that what was formerly conjecture, is now conviction. What men formerly predicted as prophets, they may relate as historians. The progress of reform, by erecting the tree of liberty, became subversion. In the first æra of the revolution, the elective franchise was ascertained, and confined to active citizens, men of certain qualifications, of age and property. This was the basis of their first reform. But this plan was soon thought inadequate: concession proved but the parent of demand, and the redress of grievances the approbation
of

of discontent. The people felt success as a testimony of power, and began to speculate instead of to enjoy.

They perceived that in twenty-six millions of people, there were not three millions of active citizens, and that the immediate electors were not in the proportion of one to an hundred of the people.

The great majority of the people, who considered themselves as the authors and the object of the reform, began to discover that they were unrepresented; and being unrepresented, their new philosophy taught them that they were slaves, and that personal representation was necessary to liberty; and by the usual revolutionary expedients of clubs and conventions they speedily accomplished their object, and with that the democracy of France. The temperate reform was the rudiments of all that followed; it was the first prize of political disquisition; it was the first trophy of popular success. I will not deny that the abuses which the spirit of revolt had so much exaggerated, existed in the administration of public affairs; for what Government upon earth is exempt from them? Every state contains some evils and imperfections, which by wisdom may be alleviated or removed; and I would give to the living generation the right of altering and amending, but would withhold from it the dangerous privilege of demolition. You may say, perhaps, that every establishment ought to be so pliable as to bend to those alterations which a change of opinion may produce. But will not this circumstance, that our opinions are so liable to change, warrant a certain degree of hesitation and distrust of them? If this change be no more than the gradual progress of truth and philosophy, whether is it not more wise to suffer the alterations and improvements which it may work, to proceed gradually and correspondently, or let one set of cotemporary men assume at once the whole task of a sudden and entire alteration, with as much precipitancy as little reflection? We see how the people can act when their power is commensurate to their will; and if we will not profit by the

the example of others, we may possibly add to our future misfortunes the aggravation of self reproach. With such an example before your eyes, will you talk of a temperate reform? Consider the danger of altering the representation, because the operation of politics is upon the human mind, where the force or influence of causes cannot be measured, and may unsettle the minds of men at a time when they are but too easily unsettled, and expose the property of the nation, without the means of defence, to the cupidity of those who have none. If you give the authority of partial concession to extravagant demands, neither your interests, nor your characters, however respectable, will have authority to repress its growth or controul its excess. The history of all times shews, that those who commence popular discontent, are not always those who end it. Hampden raised the spirit of opposition to the King, but did not live to see the catastrophe that ended it.

When the Hampdens and Pym, the great band of patriots and heroes, who stood forth for the liberties of England, had broken the power of King Charles the First, and had ripened the great cause, as they thought, and seemed about to obtain those permanent limitations upon the Monarchy, and those pledges of security in the hands of the people, which would guard their rights in future times; the spirit which they had raised overworked their purposes.

A new party sprung forward composed of dark Republican Independents, who scorned all moderate reform, drove the patriots from the stage, and overwhelmed them, the King, and the Constitution, in one general ruin.

To give you another lesson on the personal consequences to the leaders, when a nation has been put in motion, what is become of all those men who stood foremost in the struggle for patriotism in France, when the old Government was overthrown? You must acknowledge that an unanimous determination of reforming

reforming abuses prevailed. The King himself was anxious to do it. The two-thirds of the state renounced in a solemn manner their pecuniary privileges, which were the only privileges they enjoyed that could be deemed in the smallest degree onerous to the people. The clergy offered to deposit a hundred millions of livres on the altar of the country. The nobility hastened with ardour to second the paternal views of the Monarch. But the perfidious delegates rejected those benevolent regulations which would have defeated their own atrocious designs, whose requisitions on this subject you may learn from the minutes of their associations and clubs, where they give a full and faithful delineation of it, which is founded on a decided principle, and goes to a decided purpose, personal representation detached from property, universal suffrage and pure Democracy—a transfer of power, and not a Reform in Parliament.

Before we venture to be discontented with the Government under which we live, it would be a proof of our wisdom to consider, how far it is capable of being improved by fallible creatures not superior to men. Speculative men may form an idea of a Government more perfect than ours; but speculative men ought not to forget, that whatever notions of excellence may be conceived, yet in practice and in real life, every human system must be imperfect in which men are actors, because every system in which men are actors, necessarily partakes of their weakness and imperfection. If abuses have made their way into our constitution, let them be removed by the fostering hand of public harmony and peace, and the spirit of that Constitution be restored by no other engines but those of reason and argument. You have a strong moral warning against the imitation of those who have brought ruin on themselves and their country. Hardly a man of all those who were in the management of public affairs in France, now remains. Where is Fayette, Lamath, Barnave, Rochfaucault, and all the leaders who directed

the first decisive measures, and bore up the country in the shock of the revolution? They have all disappeared from the scene. The Duke of Brissac, the eloquent Clermont, Tonnerre, the learned and acute advocate M. De Pascalis, are no more. Some were obliged to fly for their lives at the first change of popular opinion, and, in the state of parties, pined in foreign prisons. Some lay in the dungeons of the provincial towns of France itself; others stabbed in the public walks of Paris, or massacred in the goals of the country which they laboured to save; and all ruined and trod down by various forms of violence. The names of all the men in office or power, are new, are continually changing. Rulers follow each other in quick succession, as various in character, as different in principle. To shew you how rapid the strides of innovation are, permit me to observe that the democracies in France were of short duration. They passed away like the whirlwind in the wilderness, desolating, but transitory; and soon yielded, as all popular insurrections have ever done, to the predominant tyranny of some of the most contemptible of their leaders; who however had the dexterity to ride on the whirlwind and direct the storm. Blowing up the flame of sedition, the tempest at length overtook them, and shewed a just sacrifice to the mighty ruin they projected. Did not the glorious success which attended the propagation of freedom and the conversion of slavery on the very frontiers of France and Austria, convince these hot-brained sons of tumult and disturbance of the falsity and folly of their speculations; which, as laid down in the abstract manner of modern philosophers, were a mere pedantic abuse of elementary principles? It was but right that they should bear their part in the ruin they projected. Casuists themselves, they have been persecuted by the force of their own precepts, and fallen victims to the spirit of innovation which themselves had inspired. Neither their talents nor their virtues, nor the splendid rashness of their first enterprize could atone for their subsequent preservation.

It

It is a reflection which cannot be too often recalled to the attention of every description of persons, that many of the most conspicuous characters in the Revolution; those moreover who had gloried in having voted for the death of their Sovereign, and armed the executioner with the fatal instrument, have perished on that very scaffold, by that very guillotine they prepared for their Sovereign.

Is it not very wonderful that they should perish by an instrument of their own invention? To those who look seriously into the ways of Providence, the unerring justice of the Great Ruler of causes and events is wonderfully displayed. It was a singular interference of Providence that those very persons, who had boasted of their having produced the scenes of the tenth of August, and the second of September, by which the prisons were filled, should afterwards, by a subsequent revolution, be thrown into the same prisons. The author* of the Rights of Man sunk into the depths of a dungeon. He that propogated the new doctrines of his refined philosophy in England, by his arrest in France, received the first practical proof of the Sovereignty of the People, the theory of which he had preached up with so much apostolic zeal; and the man† who was appointed to destroy all ideas of religion, and to carry and establish the new born system of philosophical atheism through the provinces of Germany, turned his arm against that very power, which had entrusted him with this diabolical command; seized the very Commissioners sent to see the terrible purposes executed, and sent them in chains to that State which they had devoted to destruction. I shall leave them with the consolation of having attempted the gretest mischiefs. It is too severe to call upon them for proofs, who have not been aware of the extent of their own principles, which went so far as to pronounce our Government to be the generating cause not only of the commotions in France, but of the riots and

D 2

tumults

* Paine. † Dumourier.

tumults that at different times happened in this country. But was Government the generating, that is, if words have any meaning, the active cause of the riots at Birmingham? Was it the cause of the riots in 1780? Did it rouse Jack Cade and the levellers of former times, the renowned predecessors of the French levellers and their humble imitators in England? Certainly in one sense it did; for if there was no Government, there could be no opposition; and the King in the same view, is the generating cause of Paine's pamphlet. Such is the reasoning that is to make converts of the whole kingdom. Heurtault, in his funeral oration before the council of Five Hundred, on the late French Ministers at Rastadt, observes, *Bonnier began and ended his life with misfortune*. He was born noble, and he died by assassination. To be born noble, and to perish by the dagger of the assassin, is considered by the author as an equal calamity; and indeed the Great Nation has given it proof. Every French nobleman, except those who have been apostates to their King, their Country, and their GOD, has fallen by the hands of the anarchists, perished on the scaffold, or been exiled into foreign countries, robbed of his property, and destined by his persecutors to die in misery.

Where men follow their natural impulses, they will rejoice to see illustrious characters in possession of their hereditary honours. Nobility is a graceful ornament to the civil order. It is the Corinthian capital of polished society. We value ancient nobility, and we are not disinclined to augment it with new honours. We feel that no Commonwealth can by any possibility long subsist without a body of some kind or other of nobility, decorated with honour and fortified by knowledge, not as an excuse for inglorious sloth, but as an incitement to virtuous activity. The right to a title or situation of dignity, legally obtained, is as much to be respected, as any other social right. These things were first obtained on various lawful considerations; and to destroy them is as unjust, as to pull down the cottage of the villager. Nobility forms the chain
that

that connects the ages of a nation. To talk of hereditary Monarchy, without any thing else of hereditary reverence, in a Commonwealth, is a low minded absurdity, fit only for the Orleans and the perfidious Sans Culottes of the French nation, who, like the Demoniacs, possessed with a spirit of fallen pride and inverted ambition, abdicate their dignities, disown their families, betray the most sacred of all trusts, and, by breaking to pieces the great link of society, bring eternal confusion and desolation on their country. — Is it with the name of Lord that they are dissatisfied, or with the inequality which it announces? are they cavellers, or are they levellers? Hating authority, they delight to blacken all who are possessed of it, while they, with equal truth, represent the body of the people, and even the unlettered multitude, as all purity and perfection. Believe me, those who attempt to level, never equalize. The citizen of Paine's State inhabits the neighbourhood of a volcano: no sooner has the lava of a former eruption mellowed the soil, and begun to smile with cultivation, than all is again overwhelmed in the torrent of a fresh explosion. The calm is but temporary; the permanent principles of nature continue to operate, and by degrees reproduce the inequality which was thus violently destroyed. The motive arises afresh, and is followed by a fresh destruction. And thus for ever the machine revolves, presenting us alternately with the motive and the mischief. The leveller does not produce equality (for that is not the proper name to give it) but exchanges permanency for fluctuation, and civil rank for natural inequality; changes never made for man. In natural equality we behold the unsteady swell or fluctuation of a sea; in civil rank, the irregular surface of an improved country. Savage life is the infancy of the human species, and civilization its maturity. This new system of Government is, in reality, the oldest; because most consistent with the natural rights of man, as it would let loose a banditti of ruffians to overrun the country, where the principal robber would become the

the Monarch. The progress from civil life to citizenship is through a long course of gradual cultivation. The equality of savage men is the chaos of the species, a regulated and subordinate equality, the fair creation. Personal distinctions, arising from superior probity, learning, eloquence, skill, courage, and from every other excellency of talents, are the very blood and nerves of the body politic; they animate the whole, and invigorate every part. Visionary politicians can never pretend, by any regulation whatsoever, to confound the natural operation of different qualities. Will they level industry with indolence, mental capacity with incapacity, prudence with imprudence, and virtue with vice? The question deserves no answer. To force you to be equal, would hinder you from being free. You could not be free to gain property, and to make yourselves rich by honest industry. If people are to have what they earn, they cannot long be equal; and if they are not to have what they earn by honest labour, I do not see how they are likely to be happy. Sincerely as I am attached to the liberties of mankind, I cannot but profess myself an utter enemy to that spurious philosophy, that democratic insanity, which would equalize all property, and level all distinctions in civil society. In an age of political theory, and of appeals from our own to other Governments as more excellent; at a time when the spirit of liberty has proceeded so far, in one of the most despotic nations of Europe, as to overturn the established Constitution of the country; it may not be amiss to consider the favourite dreams of our modern sophists; for, in serious language, they deserve not the name of philosophers. Among these dreams, is that captivating delusion of the vulgar, a system of equality. Each human being they assert is originally formed equal with each other—all are equal in the earth, to which each is finally consigned—And why, they triumphantly demand, should not equality prevail during their residence on the globe, of which they are by nature equal inheritors? Specious as this reasoning may appear to superficial inquirers, it shrinks, like
every

every phantom of error, from the torch of truth. By that divine light then, let us, for a moment, view these assertions, and we shall be at a loss for a reply to this insolent question ; which carries with it no less a consequence, than that of blasphemously arraigning the justice of our Creator. With God, be assured, it is no favourite doctrine. The fallacy of it is proved by the experience of every day, by the occurrences of all history from the earliest times ; and above all, by the contemplation of the works of the Creator, whether animate or inanimate, the very essence of which appears to be gradation or inequality. That all men are originally formed equal, is not true. We are neither equal at our births, in size, in shape, in feature, nor in complexion ; and who that is not absurd and presumptuous can pretend to demonstrate, that our intellectual qualities, or mere natural capacities, possess less variety than our corporeal forms ? Our organs of sense, in the earliest stages of infancy, every one knows, are more or less perfect. Some are born totally, and some partially blind or deaf ; some have natural impediments in their speech, and some are entirely dumb. I argue from the works of Nature. — Why are not the different species of creatures alike in size, beauty and excellence ? Why is one man made with a more agile and energetic body than another ? And why is his genius more lively ? That this is the real case, no man can deny. Instead therefore of allowing that all are originally equal, I shall take the liberty to affirm, what I sincerely believe, that there never were in reality two beings exactly alike ; and deplorably ignorant must he be, who cannot discover that a natural equality amongst mankind is contradictory to the actual condition of human nature.

Women are not equal to their husbands, children are not equal to their parents, the foolish are not equal to the wise, the idle and dissolute are not equal to the sober and industrious. They cannot have equal rights, because the rights of man in society, so long as we admit there is a divine law, and a moral Governor

nor of the world, are the rights of duty, virtue and religion; and no other rights can subsist in a state of civilization.

That all men are, in some respects, equal by nature, I do not pretend to deny. We all come into the world naked and helpless; we all cling to the breast for sustenance; and after passing through the portion of life which the universal Parent has allotted us, we retire to the common home which Nature has prepared for all her children. But, in the interval from the cradle to the grave, social life forbids this equality. If all mankind were equally blessed with wealth and fortune in this world, how would the order of civil life be subverted, and the best and most distinguished graces of the man and of the christian be rendered altogether useless, if not impracticable? For in a general and equal abundance, whom could we relieve? And were all alike exalted, to whom could we condescend? The distinctions of life ought to be kept up, and order maintained. Superiority and pride, dignity and vanity, are quite different things, and should not be rashly confounded. Those very men who declaim so impatiently upon the natural rights of man, what would they have known of those rights, if they had been born in a state of nature? Would they have been capable of examining them, reasoning on them, or in any wise understanding them? No—it is to the Government against which they inveigh, that they are indebted for every thing which they value, even for the talent of inveighing against it.

Government enforces the laws of Nature. Nature has filled the breast of the mother with milk, and her heart with tenderness for her offspring. Government goes further—If the mother should die, it protects the infant. It protects it in the very womb, protects it in the cradle, protects it in its childhood, protects it in its youth; feeds it, clothes it, instructs it. Does it then owe no gratitude to Government? Creatures themselves have no natural right to any thing, unless it can
be

be proved, that they had a natural right to be created. Can any thing belonging to a dependent being be of itself independent? To suppose this, is to make the creature independent of the Creator. No being has any natural right but God, who, by virtue of creation, has a natural essential right to the obedience of his creatures. From the moment of our birth we are the servants of God, and as this is a relation never to be dissolved, so the duties thence resulting can never be superseded. So that this supposed liberty is forfeited from our very birth; and the moment we come into the world, we are in a state of subjection.

This obligation is congenial with our being, and commences from the moment of our nativity. It is inseparable from us. We stipulate for its performance in Baptism, and as we grow up and are farther incorporated, our obligations still rise and increase in proportion to our age and abilities. We are sworn into all the duties of allegiance, and give further pledges of it to God and the King.

Instead of talking so much then about the rights of man, I recommend it to you most earnestly to change the course of your studies, and to investigate with particular attention, the duties of subjects. The task may not be more pleasing, but it will be infinitely more useful. Every man has his station and place in the community, and no one is under such a state of liberty, as to be such an individual as not to belong to the body politic, or bear no relation to it. This is not the condition of our nature; nor is it conceivable how any man can pursue a considerable course of action without its having some effect upon others; or, of course, without producing some degree of responsibility for his conduct.

The situations in which we respectively stand, produce the rules and principles of that responsibility, and afford directions to prudence in acting it. In all countries, now and then villains and thieves plunder the industrious inhabitants. So far as this happens, liberty

is certainly too great: I mean the liberty of those lawless persons. The society which admits the rights of violence and rapine, is *felo de se*. There is no medium between a true subject and a rebel: the moment a man ceases to be one, he commences the other. If free-thinkers be consistent with themselves, they must be free actors too, and can live under no jurisdiction or controul. They are equally without guides or governors; owe as little allegiance to their prince, as faith to their God. They are dependent on neither, and rebels against both. I hope there are few amongst us of this description. To be honoured and privileged by the laws, has nothing to provoke envy in any nation. Even to be tenacious of these privileges, cannot absolutely be a crime. The strong struggle in every individual, to preserve possession of what he has found belong to him, and to distinguish him, is one of the securities against injustice implanted in our nature. It operates as an instinct to secure property, and to preserve communities in a settled state. To preserve a Constitution so dear to us all, in its established form and spirit, is the duty of every man, who has any regard to his own happiness, or that of the public. Whoever considers by what means the most flourishing kingdom in the world, and the best church that ever was since the primitive times, were miserably harrassed and destroyed, cannot be content to have them ruined again in the same treacherous and sacriligious manner. That pen must be dipt in tears, which assays to describe the bloody horrors, and the tragical scenes in this nation; the rivers of blood that flowed in the streets of Britain, when Presbetry sat at the counsel board, Independency voted in our Parliament, and Fanaticism had the reigns of power in its own hands. Would you have Hampdens and Pym again at our counsel boards, Bradshaws upon the bench, Barebones in your senate, or Cromwells and Iretons in your fleets and armies? The Church would not suffer alone, nor would Religion be the only bleeding sacrifice. The State would be a partner with the Church in its losses, and we should

should see what it was to want a King, whose loins were not half so heavy, as would be the little fingers of those usurping tyrants. Liberty, the darling of the nation, the blessing of Kings, but the engine of traitors; Liberty would be confined within the narrow compass of a dungeon—nor would it fare better with property. The Prince, indeed, might get two crowns for one; a crown of martyrdom, and a crown of glory, for a diadem of thorns; but what would his enemies gain besides infamy and a curse, and a seared tender conscience they themselves would find at the great day of retribution. And what the nation would lose, we may reckon a little now—We should lose a Prince too good for us to keep, and, good God! too sacred to be destroyed. We should lose our laws too—our privileges would be invaded; and, if we had property enough to be thought malignants, our lives would be sacrificed. These are the prospects I have before my eyes, when loyalty is to be accounted malignity, and episcopacy anti-christianity, and the most miserable oppression and slavery of two-thirds of the people, is to be celebrated as a state of christian liberty to the prevailing party; which prospects having been once realized in this church and kingdom, cannot be deemed altogether chimerical. I have been considering in what form and manner they would employ you in accomplishing their designs, and how your assistance could be most effectually administered. They could hardly mean that you should assist them with the pen, and write upon reformation, for very few amongst you are scholars; nor with the tongue, for still fewer are orators. I know not how they could employ you otherwise, except it be with fire and sword, as the reformers were assisted in the last century. Perhaps they would not object to your assistance as unwarrantable in the cause of liberty, though you should accomplish their purposes by pulling the clergy from their pulpits, the magistrates from their chairs, the judges from their benches, the two houses of parliament from their seats, and the king from his throne. If you would preserve the legislature from a second catas-

trophe, resist the spirit of innovation in its first attempt: never tamper with turbulence, nor favour disquisitions that would make the people politicians, detach the public mind from a veneration for our ancient establishment, and let it loose into the mazes of speculation and experiment. If you admit the smallest and most specious change in our parliamentary system, you are lost: you will be driven from one step to another; from principles just in theory, to consequences most pernicious in practice; and your first conceptions will be productive of every subsequent mischief, for which you will be answerable to your country and to posterity. I do not pretend to say (in my honest and warm encomiums on our excellent constitution,) that we have arrived at the utmost limits of that perfection which, perhaps, we may arrive at; for all governments are to be amended by experience, and to have recruits to their strength, and remedies to their distempers; and whenever these are palpably felt and acknowledged by the generality of the people, they should be remedied; but not by enlisting the passions of the vulgar; by energies from without, (as one of our wild and levelling opponents expresses himself) but by sober and constitutional appeals to the legislature. I would caution you from hazarding such experiments, which would at all times be rashness, but at this time infatuation. It should be considered whether the present season will admit of the business of reformation, and whether the evils to be remedied will justify the danger of the medicine. When the nation is closely pressed with foreign foes and native traitors, and the wisdom and union of the state are requisite for our common defence; when public danger demands the heart and hand of every subject to be exerted for the common safety; whether this be a time to create jealousy and alarm; to adjust delicate plans of reform at the risk of public harmony? In such an awful crisis, it becomes all who appeal to the public on political subjects, to do it with great caution, and a sense of duty. This is no season for inflammatory harangues, to create divisions in the nation.

nation. At this awful moment, let faction pause, and unanimity take place among our senators. Let there be a present union among the contending parties. Let all hands and hearts coalesce in suppressing popular tumults, in stifling the first breath of insurrection. Let all private views and party differences be buried in the general good of the country; every speculative opinion kept back, and the business of reformation postponed to times more serene, and a crisis more favourable. It is impossible to look into the peculiar situation of this country, and the condition of the world around us, without seeing that this is not the time to agitate questions of political experiment. The temper of the times, and the situation of the surrounding universe, should caution you from justifying the popular demand, which seems to have no fundamental principle to preserve the equipoise and temperature between two principal discordant parts in the government—royalty and democracy. The reform of which we most stand in need at present, is a more general observance of morality, and a stricter attention to religion; less dissipation, and more œconomy. This would untenant our prisons, and make trials at the Old Bailey less frequent; reduce the number of Thelwalls in their speeches, Margarots in their principles, and Muirs in their practices, and promote a more general disposition of trust and confidence in the representatives of the people, by cordially uniting them in strengthening the hands of government, and supporting the glorious fabric of the British constitution, the rock of ages, and the wonder of the universe,



nation. At this awful moment, let action pause and
 instantly take place among our countrymen. Let
 be a present union among the countrymen. Let
 of hands and feet be in supporting popular
 authority in striking the first stroke of insurrection.
 Let all interests and party differences be buried in
 the general good of the country; every individual
 citizen must look to the business of reformation
 positions to times more serene, and a crisis more fa-
 vourable. It is impossible to look into the possible
 situation of this country, and the condition of the
 world around us, without seeing that this is not the
 time to waste powers of political experiment. The
 temper of the times, and the situation of the country
 imperatively should caution you from indulging the
 popular demand, which seems to have now fundamental
 principle to preserve the capital and temperance
 between two principal discontent parts in the govern-
 ment—royalty and democracy. The reform of which
 we are in need at present, is a more general one
 reform of morality, and a more attention to reli-
 gion; the abolition of the slave trade, and the
 reformation of our prisons, and the state of the Old Bailey
 less frequent; reduce the number of the walls in their
 spacious, magnificent, and more comfortable
 of the present, and the general disposition
 of time and conscience. Representatives of the
 people, by cordially uniting in strengthening the
 bonds of government, and supporting the glorious in-
 stitute of the British constitution, the rock of ages, and
 the corner stone of the empire.



